



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/689,388	10/20/2003	Michael Philip Clark	8717MR2	4154

27752 7590 11/07/2005

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DIVISION  
WINTON HILL TECHNICAL CENTER - BOX 161  
6110 CENTER HILL AVENUE  
CINCINNATI, OH 45224

EXAMINER

MCKENZIE, THOMAS C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1624

DATE MAILED: 11/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/689,388	CLARK ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Thomas McKenzie, Ph.D.	1624	

**All Participants:**

**Status of Application:** new CIP

(1) Thomas McKenzie, Ph.D.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Richard Eshler.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Time:** 10:00 am

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

**Rejection(s) discussed:**

*Potential enablement rejections to use claims 10 and 11, potential statutory double patenting rejection to claim 12, and potential obviousness-type double patenting rejections to claims 10-13.*

**Claims discussed:**

1-16

**Prior art documents discussed:**

*none*

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner indicated that claims 1-9 and 14-16 were allowable but various rejections would be made to claims 10-13. The Examiner suggested cancellation of claims 10-13 and proceeding with a first action allowance. Applicants proposed submission of terminal disclaimers for their patents 6,730,668, 6,849,627, and 6,960,593. This TD would overcome the ODP rejection to claim 13, which would then be allowable as well. Although not mentioned in the telephone interview, the first line of the specification needs to be updated to reflect issuance of the parent application as US Patent No. 6,730,668.